

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In response to the Final Rejection dated September 7, 2005, Claims 1-51 and 53-85 remain in this application. Claims 1, 2, 36, 48, 53, 59, 73, 74, 81, 82 and 83 have been amended. Claim 52 has been canceled.

Claims 1, 5-10, 12-14, 30, 35, 45, 46, 55-58, and 86-87 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b).

Claims 11, 15-29, 31-34, 37-44, 70-72 and 79-80 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a).

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Examiner's indication of the allowability of the subject matter of Claims 2-4, 36, 48-54, 59-69, 73-78 and 81-85.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Claims 1, 5-10, 12-14, 30, 35, 45, 46, 55-58 and 86 and 87 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Chen et al. (US Pat. No. 6,139,697).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

First Rejection: Claim 11 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen et al. (US Pat. No. 6,139,697) in view of Wu et al. (US Pat. No. 4,584,026).

Second Rejection: Claim 47 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen et al.

Third Rejection: Claims 22-25 and 70-72 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen et al. in view of Paton et al. (US Pat. No. 6,811,448 B1).

Fourth Rejection: Claims 26-29, 32-34, 37-44 and 79-80 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen et

al. in view of Wolf (Silicon Processing for the VLSI Era; Vol. 1).

Fifth Rejection: Claims 15-21 and 31 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen et al. in view of Chung et al. (US Pat. No. 6,513,538).

Amendments/Remarks:

The allowable claims (i.e., Claims 2, 36, 48, 52, 9, 73, 74, 81, 82, 83) have been re-written in independent form to put the application into condition for allowance in order to expedite prosecution. The limitations of allowable Claim 52 have been added to Claim 1, and Claim 52 has therefore been canceled. Each of the rejected claims now depends (directly or indirectly) from one of the allowable claims that has been re-written in independent form. Therefore, all of the pending claims are allowable on that basis, with the exception of Claim 6, which will now be discussed.

The undersigned wishes to thank the Examiner for the courtesy of a telephone interview on November 3, 2005. During that interview, the Examiner suggested that he would consider allowing Claim 5 provided that the limitation of a P-N junction were added to the claim. Such an addition corresponds to Claim 6. Accordingly, in view of this potential offering from the Examiner, Claim 6 has been re-written in independent form (by adding the language of Claims 1 and 5 to Claim 6) in the hope that the Examiner would allow Claim 6 in view of the telephone interview. If, contrariwise, the Examiner ultimately concludes that Claim 6 is not allowable, the undersigned would appreciate a telephone call from the Examiner at the earliest possible opportunity.

SUMMARY

In view of the foregoing correction and remarks, it is felt that the rejections of the claims under 35 USC 102(b) and 35 USC 103(a) have been overcome. Therefore, withdrawal of these objections and rejections is respectfully requested and allowance of the application is earnestly solicited.

If, However, the Examiner believes that this amendment or any requests contained in this amendment raise new issues, the Examiner should telephone Robert Wallace at (805) 644-4035 so that appropriate arrangements can be made for resolving such issues as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully submitted,



Dated: 11/07/2005

Robert M. Wallace
Reg. No. 29,119
Attorney for Applicants
Customer No. 000044843

Robert M. Wallace
Patent Attorney
2112 Eastman Avenue, Suite 102
Ventura, CA 93003
(805) 644-4035